

## REMARKS

Receipt of the Office Action of February 17, 2009 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 5 - 10 have been examined and rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over "PROFIBUS" in view of Diedrich.

This rejection has been carefully considered and as a result is respectfully traversed.

In the commentary on the rejection, the examiner concurs that "PROFIBUS" "does not explicitly disclose "syntactically and semantically correct and producing device descriptions by means of a compiler and converting device descriptions into software module by means of a compiler." For this teaching the examiner turns to Diedrich.

Let us therefore consider Diedrich. Diedrich does not refer to a method for producing **software modules** for field appliances. Please refer to page 2 of the specification for a discussion of the software modules. Each software module encapsulates all data and functions of the particular field device. In addition, these software modules are configured in such a way that the user interface always looks the same. The application program which serves for access to the field devices accesses the field device via a defined interface. Therefore, there is access to the field devices by **any** application program. Note that Diedrich does not indicate any familiarity with such software modules.

The examiner refers us to pg. 165, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph of Diedrich. Here it is explicitly stated that "the device description has to be based on a device model because of the semantic behind the lexical and syntactical elements." The

corresponding device model is described in detail in paragraph 2 on page 165. From a consideration of this disclosure, it is not clear how this disclosure is particularly relevant to the present invention. When one considers Fig. 6 of Diedrich, one sees that the device descriptions according to the device model are transformed **by a lot of different compilers and translators**. The use of a lot of different compilers for transforming the device descriptions not having a uniform form, or language in a standard device description **is precisely what the present invention avoids**. The present invention does not need different compilers for different groups of existing device descriptions. In claim 5, the second compiler has a different task from that of the first compiler. The second compiler makes a compilation of the standard device descriptions into software modules

Claim 5 has been amended to specify that the standard device descriptions produced are from device descriptions for filed devices **not having a uniform form or language**. This limitation cannot, it is respectfully submitted, be extracted from either PROFIBUS or Diedrich.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 5 - 10 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio

Attorney for Applicant

Registration Number 25,721

Date: May 18, 2009

**Customer Number \*23364\***

**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\WITT3005-CD0176\May 18 2009 Response.wpd